

| | | | |
|--------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/602,107 | LEWIS, JEAN | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Terrence R. Till | 1744 | |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Terrence R. Till. (3)_____.

(2) Jean Lewis. (4)_____.

Date of Interview: 22 February 2006.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☒ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: Proposed claim amendment.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-5.

Identification of prior art discussed: German patent of Huthner.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required

Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews

Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's proposed amendment was discussed and the examiner proposed adding language to claim 1 to include a mechanism to produce vacuum under wet and dry conditions. Additionally, the examiner suggested that applicant write a new claim 6 to recite that there are removable cleaning attachments. applicant was directed to submit drawings that have only one reference character "25" and then recite in the specification that other attachments could be used.

Appl. No. : 10/602,107
Applicant : Jean M. Lewis
Filed : Jun 24, 2003
TC/A.U. : 7590
Examiner : Terrence R. Till
Docket No : N/A
Customer No : 36265

*THIS is a proposed Amendment
for Interview*

Commissi
P.O. Box
Alexandr

NOT A FORMAL Response

Sir:

In response to the office action of 28 Nov 2005,
please amend the above-identified application as follows:

Amendments to the claims are reflected in the listing of
claims which begins on page 2 of this paper.

Remarks/arguments begin on page 4 of this paper.

Appl No 10/602,107

Reply to office action of 28 Nov 2005

Amendments to the Claims:

This listing of claims will replace all prior versions, and listing of claims in the application:

Listing of Claims:

Claim 1 (currently amended) ~~A garment containing devices to deliver cleaning solutions, remove, and store used solutions, enabling the individual wearing it to efficiently clean surfaces.~~ A wearable device which delivers, removes, and stores wet and dry solutions,

~~comprising:~~ ^{removable} *Body* ^{mounted to said wearable device}

- a. bladder reservoirs to contain the liquids
- b. a selector dial functioning as a conduit allowing to choose one or more liquid.

c. [removable cleaning attachments] ^{the device}

c. d. ^{mounted to said wearable device} a mechanism ^{to produce a vacuum under wet and dry} ~~and~~

~~Claim 2. The cleaning garment of claim 1 further includes bladder reservoirs that contain cleaning solutions.~~

²
~~claims~~ (cancelled)

claims 2-5 (cancelled)

claim 6 (now) The wearable device of claim 1, further
compr. ~~rem~~

~~Claim 3 the cleaning garment of claim 1 further contains a selector dial locate don't he garment that allows the wearer to choose a desired cleaning solution.~~

~~Claim 4. the cleaning garment of claim 1 further including a mechanism to produce a vacuum under wet and dry conditions.~~

~~Claim 5 the cleaning garment of claim 1 further including a waste reservoir that is located on the garment to hold the solid and liquid wastes that are produced during the spray cleaning process.~~

Appl No 10/602,107

Reply to office action of 28 Nov 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. I have fully considered the rejections of record in the case, and am providing a complete response to these rejections. Based on informal, professional patent law advice, further evaluation of prior art, and my own extensive reading of the book "patent it yourself", I have **amended all claims** originally submitted with my application. I apologize for my lack of coherent, concise claims in my original application - it was my first attempt in writing claims as a pro se inventor.

General Arguments.

Drawings

I have attached a copy of modified drawings to insure they comply with 37 CFR 1.121 (d).

Claim rejections - 35 USC 102

1. Response to Claims 1,4, and 5 that are rejected as being anticipated by German patent to Huther (DE 2713995).

Appl No 10/602,107

Reply to office action of 28 Nov 2005

a. After having this patent translated and reviewing it carefully, I determined that it does not contain substantial subject matter to be considered similar to my invention.

(1) Particularly, Hunther's patent does not contain a device which serves as a conduit or selector dial to choose one or multiple cleaning solutions. Additionally, it does not describe a wearable, comfortable garment-like device that contains cleaning solutions located within bladders. And finally, it does not account for a variety of cleaning attachments that can be used with the apparatus.

2. Response to additional criteria considered pertinent to my disclosure in the patents to Dalbey, Owens, Roy et al, Salistan, Huffman et al, Reigber et al, Barba and French Patent to Credo, which disclose devices mounted to a user to take up either dry or liquid debris, and finally, the patent to McKenzie, which discloses a bladder bag worn by a user for re-hydration. Individually, the preceding devices contain some elements described in my invention, however

Appl No 10/602,107

Reply to office action of 28 Nov 2005

several critical elements, such as the multiple solution containment bladders, the conduit to select multiple or mixed solutions, or cleaning attachments for the variety of surfaces.

a. Even if combined, the cited references (summarized below) would not meet the claims of the present invention. Thus, it would be necessary to make modifications, not taught in the prior art in order to combine the references, which would still be lacking substantial parts. Ultimately, there is no motivation to modify these inventions or combine them in the manner specified.

(1) Barbra, 3,165,774, Portable vacuum apparatus to collect debris-laden liquids. This particular device doesn't disseminate cleaning fluids or provide an apparatus to perform cleaning operations on it.

(2) Reiber, et al, 3,331,090, Liquid suction, storage, and discharge device. Device has a valve to change from between an application liquid and a used, dirty liquid).

Appl No 10/602,107

Reply to office action of 28 Nov 2005

However, it doesn't provide for the use of multiple cleaning solutions or applicator apparatus.

(3) Owens, D344,632, back supported carpet cleaning unit Unit contains a single compartment to administer liquid agents as well as has applicator apparatus.

(4) Huffman, 5,836,046, Portable Water extraction cleaner This invention is designed as an improvement to the mechanics of locating the two fluid receiving/ water tanks into a recess of the vacuum housing for easy removal and placement.

(5) Salisian, 6,305,048, Electric backpack blower and accessory operator Invention is a blower backpack with noise reduction. Does not disseminate or pick up liquids.

(6) Roy, et al, 6,568,026, Portable backpack vacuum.
Dry vacuum only - improved filter apparatus)

Appl No 10/602,107

Reply to office action of 28 Nov 2005

(7) McKenzie, 2002/0123294, Water bladder bag worn for rehydration. Classification 2/69; the technical field of this patent is not in the same category as the present invention. McKenzie's patent, uses manual, siphoning action to remove a liquid. Thus it lacks a mechanical device to remove solutions that are worn on the body.